#3

Attorney's Docket No.: 066744-0012

UNITED STATES PATENT APPLICATION
COMBINED DECLARATION AND POWER OF ATTORNEY

As a below named inventor, I hereby declare that:

My residence, post office address and citizenship are as stated below next to my name. I believe I am the original, first and sole inventor (if only one name is listed below) or an original, first and joint inventor (if plural names are listed below) of the subject matter which is claimed and for which a patent is sought on the invention entitled: SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR FUSION-ALIGNED REPROJECTION OF INCOMPLETE DATA the specification of which was filed March 9, 2001, as Serial No. 09/802,468 for which I solicit a United States patent.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF REVIEW OF PAPERS AND DUTY OF CANDOR

I hereby state that I have reviewed and understand the contents of the above identified specification, including the claims, as amended by any amendment referred to above. I acknowledge the duty to disclose information which is material to patentability as defined in 37 Code of Federal Regulations § 1.56, and which is material to the examination of this application, namely, information where there is a substantial likelihood that a reasonable examiner would consider it important in deciding whether to allow the application to issue as a patent (see last page attached hereto).

POWER OF ATTORNEY

I hereby appoint the following attorney(s) to prosecute this application and transact all business in the Patent and Trademark Office connected therewith: Nicholas A. Kees, Reg. No. 29,552; Adam L. Brookman, Reg. No. 32,401; Brian G. Gilpin, Reg. No. 39,997; William K. Baxter, Reg. No. 41,606, and Denise L. Stoker, Reg. No. 47,111.

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Denise L. Stoker
Godfrey & Kahn, S.C.
780 North Water Street
Milwaukee, WI 53202
Tel. (414) 273-3500

DECLARATION

I hereby declare that all statements made herein of my own knowledge are true and that all statements made on information and belief are believed to be true; and further that these statements were made with the knowledge that willful false statements and the like so made are punishable by fine or imprisonment, or both, under Section 1001 of Title 18 of the United States Code, and that such willful false statements may jeopardize the validity of the application or any patent issued thereon.

Full name of first inventor

Kenneth	J.	Ruchala
(GIVEN NAME)	(MIDDLE INITIAL OR NAME)	FAMILY (OR LAST NAME)

Country of Citizenship: U.S.A.

Residence: 334 N. Allen St, #5, Madison, WI 53705

Post Office Address: Same

Inventor's signature: Kenneth Ruchala Date July 13, 2001

Full name of second inventor

Gustavo (GIVEN NAME) H. (MIDDLE INITIAL OR NAME) Olivera FAMILY (OR LAST NAME)

Country of Citizenship: Argentine

Residence: 220 Westridge Pkwy Verona WI 53593

Post Office Address: Same

Inventor's signature: [signature] Date July 13 2001

Full name of third inventor

Thomas (GIVEN NAME) R. (MIDDLE INITIAL OR NAME) Mackie FAMILY (OR LAST NAME)

Country of Citizenship: U.S.A.

Residence: 7763 Solstice Ct Verona WI 53593

Post Office Address: Same

Inventor's signature: [signature] Date July 13, 2001

Full name of fourth inventor

Jeffrey (GIVEN NAME) M. (MIDDLE INITIAL OR NAME) Kapatoes FAMILY (OR LAST NAME)

Country of Citizenship: U.S.A.

Residence: 2814 E. Johnson St #3 Madison WI 53704

Post Office Address: Same

Inventor's signature: [signature] JK 7/18/01 Date 13 July 2001

Full name of fifth inventor

Paul (GIVEN NAME) J. (MIDDLE INITIAL OR NAME) Reckwerdt FAMILY (OR LAST NAME)

Country of Citizenship: U.S.A.

Residence: 905 Menomonie St Madison, WI 53704

Post Office Address: Same

Inventor's signature: [signature] Date July 13-2001

RULE 56 (37 U.S.C. §1.56)

(a) A patent by its very nature is affected with a public interest. The public interest is best served, and the most effective patent examination occurs when, at the time an application is being examined, the Office is aware of and evaluates the teachings of all information material to patentability. Each individual associated with the filing and prosecution of a patent application has a duty of candor and good faith in dealing with the Office. This includes a duty to disclose to the Office all information known to that individual to be material to patentability as defined in this section. The duty to disclose information exists with respect to each pending claim until the claim is canceled or withdrawn from consideration, or the application becomes abandoned. Information that is material to the patentability of a canceled or withdrawn claim need not be submitted if the information is not material to the patentability of any of the remaining claims. There is no duty to submit information that is not material to the patentability of any existing claim. The duty to disclose all information known to be material to patentability is deemed to be satisfied if all information known to be material to patentability of any claim issued in a patent was cited by the Office or submitted to the Office in the manner prescribed by 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.97(b)-(d) and 1.98. However, no patent will be granted on an application in connection with which fraud on the Office was practiced or attempted or the duty of disclosure was violated through bad faith or intentional misconduct. The Office encourages applicants to carefully examine:

(1) prior art cited in search reports of a foreign patent office in a counterpart application, and

(2) the closest information over which individuals associated with the filing or prosecution of a patent application believe any pending claim patentably defines, to make sure that any material information contained therein is disclosed to the Office.

(b) Under this section, information is material to patentability when it is not cumulative to information already of record or being made of record in the application, and

(1) It establishes, by itself or in combination with other information, a prima facie case of unpatentability of a claim; or

(2) It refutes, or is inconsistent with, a position the applicant takes in:

(i) Opposing an argument of unpatentability relied on by the Office, or

(ii) Asserting an argument of patentability.

A prima facie case of unpatentability is established when the information compels a conclusion that a claim is unpatentable under the preponderance of evidence, burden-of-proof standard, giving each term in the claim its broadest reasonable construction consistent with the specification, and before any consideration is given to evidence which may be submitted in an attempt to establish a contrary conclusion of patentability.

(c) Individuals associated with the filing or prosecution of a patent application within the meaning of this section are:

(1) Each inventor named in the application:

(2) Each attorney or agent who prepares or prosecutes the application; and

(3) Every other person who is substantively involved in the preparation or prosecution of the application and who is associated with the inventor, with the assignee or with anyone to whom there is an obligation to assign the application.

(d) Individuals other than the attorney, agent or inventor may comply with this section by disclosing information to the attorney, agent, or inventor.

MW525606_1.DOC